

1.9511  
EM7

EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Reserve

As Obtained From

Weekly Employment Reports From FSA Migratory Labor Camps

1941 Season

Farm Security Administration

Region XI

Oregon - Washington - Idaho

Labor Division Report

February 20, 1942

Includes some comparisons with 1940 data

Prepared by cooperation of  
Labor Division and Program Analysis Unit  
FSA  
305 Terminal Sales Bldg.  
Portland, Oregon

JAN 15 1946



EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

As Obtained From

Weekly Employment Reports from the Agricultural Labor Census

1941 Season

From Security Administration

Region XI

Oregon - Washington - Idaho

Labor Division Report

February 20, 1942

Includes some comparisons with 1940 data

Prepared by cooperation of  
Labor Division and Program Analysis Unit  
FSA

305 Terminal Sales Bldg.  
Portland, Oregon

1942  
1941



## INTRODUCTION

Nineteen hundred forty-one was the second year of the operation of Farm Security Administration Migratory Labor Camps in Region XI. During this year 2 standard camps were added to the program and mobile camps were established at 14 new locations. In all, 34 camps were operated, 6 standard and 28 mobile. As in 1940 weekly employment reports were received from each camp.\*

A total of 7,933 reports were received, 1,557 of which were from single registrants. 952 of these reports, including 141 from single registrants, showed no workers employed during the week reported; an additional 787 reports had no worker employed at agricultural work, although one or more workers per report had work in some non-agricultural employment. This work was principally in processing plants and other industries related to agriculture.

For purposes of analysis we have found it convenient to confine our attention only to those reports where all employed workers were engaged at work on the same crop, and those in which the earnings and employment of each worker were specified. This procedure eliminated from the tables (1) 597 reports where family members worked in different crops, (2) 1,939 reports where all workers were unemployed or were engaged in non-agricultural work, and (3) 30 reports where the crop was not specified. In addition, it was necessary in some tables to leave out the 692 reports where the family worked as a unit, i.e., reports on which earnings of all family members were lumped together. A total of 5,585 usable reports were analyzed.

It is hoped that this summary of employment and earnings received by farm workers in 1941 will be of practical service to those who are administratively concerned with the Migratory Labor Camp Program, as well as to those who have to meet the problems presented by the threatened labor shortage in the coming season. Much of the information will, in addition, prove of interest to the general student of farm labor.

---

\*For description of methodology of collecting this sample and for other information regarding these reports, see the discussion contained in the 1940 release on "Employment and Earnings in FSA Migratory Labor Camps," or contact Farm Security Administration, 305 Terminal Sales Building, Portland, Oregon.



## INTRODUCTION

Nineteen hundred forty-one was the second year of the operation of Farm Security Administration Migratory Labor Camps in Region XI. During this year 2 standard camps were added to the program and mobile camps were established at 14 new locations. In all, 34 camps were operated, 6 standard and 28 mobile. As in 1940 weekly employment reports were received from each camp.

A total of 7,933 reports were received, 1,527 of which were from single registrants. 922 of these reports, including 141 from single registrants, showed no workers employed during the week reported; an additional 787 reports had no worker employed at agricultural work, although one or more workers per report had work in some non-agricultural employment. This work was principally in processing plants and other industries related to agriculture.

For purposes of analysis we have found it convenient to confine our attention only to those reports where all employed workers were engaged at work on the same crop, and those in which the earnings and employment of each worker were specified. This procedure eliminated from the tables (1) 597 reports where family members worked in different crops, (2) 1,939 reports where all workers were unemployed or were engaged in non-agricultural work, and (3) 30 reports where the crop was not specified. In addition, it was necessary in some tables to leave out the 692 reports where the family worked as a unit, i.e., reports on which earnings of all family members were lumped together. A total of 5,585 usable reports were analyzed.

It is hoped that this summary of employment and earnings received by farm workers in 1941 will be of practical service to those who are administratively concerned with the Migratory Labor Camp Program, as well as to those who have to meet the problems presented by the threatened labor shortage in the coming season. Much of the information will, in addition, prove of interest to the general student of farm labor.

---

For description of methodology of collecting this sample and for other information regarding these reports, see the discussion contained in the 1940 release on "Employment and Earnings in FSA Migratory Labor Camps," or contact Farm Security Administration, 305 Terminal Sales Building, Portland, Oregon.



EMPLOYMENT

It was pointed out in the analysis of the 1940 employment reports <sup>1/</sup>that under-employment was a most significant condition affecting the earnings of farm workers, and the number of workers needed. Under-employment continued to be in evidence during the 1941 season, despite a restricted supply of workers.

During the early months of the 1941 season the employment index for employed workers showed that practically no improvement had been made over a like period in 1940. More of the available labor force was being used, but the number of days work per week still reflected a very inefficient use of this labor.

A rather marked improvement in the employment index appeared after July, both over the earlier months and over a similar period in 1940. This decrease in the amount of waste time continued until the closing weeks of the season.

A variety of factors worked to bring about the increased use of the laborer's time. The general scarcity of workers was more in evidence during the fall months than in the spring and summer months. This reduction in the supply of workers not only affected the employment index directly, since the remaining workers were employed for a longer period by a single employer, but it also worked indirectly in stimulating the placement of workers on other jobs the moment they were finished working.

JAN 25 1946  
In addition, self-interest compelled employers to improve somewhat their practices of handling labor. The opportunities for the worker in industrial employment made it necessary for the farmer to assure the harvest hand more steady employment if he were to hold him. However, despite some increased efficiency in labor management, this factor of inefficient use remained the least corrected of the several elements entering into the under-employment of workers.

The decrease in the supply of workers in evidence in 1941 may be expected to grow sharper as the war effort draws men into industry and into the armed forces. Most publicized cause of this decrease in the labor supply has been the withdrawal of the more efficient agricultural laborers from the farm labor market for employment in the expanding war industries.

Not all of this labor has found employment, for unskilled labor has not been as much in demand as has skilled, but the workers preferred to wait upon an expected employment in industry rather than to lose a possible opportunity by engaging in agricultural labor at a subsistence wage.

---

<sup>1/</sup> "Employment and Earnings of Agricultural Workers Living in FSA Migratory Labor Camps in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho", 1940, by W. Paul O'Day, Labor Relations Division, Region XI.







Undoubtedly the selective service has helped to deplete the supply of labor. Even in 1941 after the first draft, 46 per cent of the single registrants in FSA camps were in the draft ages of 18 to 35. In the camp population as a whole 10 per cent of all workers, male and female, over 18 years of age were males in the preferred age group 19 to 29 years. Since the declaration of war will accelerate greatly the absorption of these young workers into the armed forces, the selective service will in 1942 undoubtedly have an increased effect on the labor supply.

A less obvious factor in the reduction of the labor force took place among the resident labor supply. Defense work and selective service acted on both the migrant and resident labor force, but in the resident labor an indirect effect was the reluctance of women and children to engage in agricultural work as the increased earnings of the family head made it unnecessary for them to supplement the family income.

The result of the decreased labor force was exaggerated somewhat in the latter months of the season due to the type of labor demanded by the principal crops harvested during these months. Crops largely using male adult workers, such as sugar beets and potatoes, would naturally be affected to a greater degree than crops employing family labor, despite the fact that such crops offer the most favorable wage rates of any agricultural employment. Greater mobility and freedom from the restraints that dependents impose, make the single worker least tolerant of low earnings and under-employment. Wherever the supply of labor, therefore, tended to reduce the amount of employment these workers could obtain, they left for employment opportunities elsewhere.

Weather conditions also had their share in producing a favorable employment index. In many crops a longer-than-normal maturing season meant more continuous employment for the workers. The longer season greatly reduced the pressure generally present to fill the field with workers for a rapid short-term harvest.

Lack of rain meant that there were less interruptions of work, and also caused an increase in worker productivity.

#### EARNINGS

More efficient use of labor increases the earnings of farm workers. Inefficient labor management in agriculture, under the piece-work wage system, results in starvation levels of income. Under conditions which will prevail in 1942, earnings must be increased if workers who are not now available are to be drawn into the agricultural labor market. There are two basic approaches to this: one is to improve the efficiency in management of farm labor, the other is a direct increase in wage rates.







Weekly earnings possible with full 6-day employment vary considerably between crops and areas due to the wide differences in piece-work wage rates. In some crops, as for instance, machine-picked peas, sugar beets, potatoes, and some of the fruits, the 1941 wage rates were at levels which would give incomes comparable to those obtained by unskilled workers in industry, if full employment had been provided. In other crops such as berries, cherries, and, in the main, all crops and operations using family labor, the raising of the employment index to 100% would still leave the earnings exceedingly low.

If there is to be any decided improvement in the lot of the workers in these crops, or if employers are to be able to hold their workers in the face of competing employment, an effort must be made both to improve employment conditions and adjust wage rates.

Comparison of the average weekly earnings for the crop years 1940 and 1941 shows that while more full employment increased weekly earnings, the most significant increases took place in crops where adjustments in wage rates also were made. This acted as an inducement for workers to remain in the labor market.

If the industry is to take the most effective and constructive means to avoid a labor shortage during the 1942 season, wage rates must be adjusted before the season starts instead of waiting until the pinch of scarcity makes such changes mandatory. Otherwise workers will tend at the beginning of the season to go into other types of employment.

#### PRINCIPAL FUNCTIONS OF FSA CAMPS IN RELATIONSHIP TO EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS

There is a decided difference in weekly employment and earnings between residents of permanent camps and mobile camps. Less difference is found in average earnings between the different standard camps than between the different mobile camps; but the earnings in standard camps are much lower than the average earnings in the majority of the mobile units.

Permanent camps, in general, house workers during periods of idleness as well as of employment, and they perhaps best reflect the actual degree of under-employment experienced by agricultural workers.

While the permanent camps are set up in areas where a variety of crops is grown, and where consequently one would expect a fairly efficient dovetailing of employment, many of the crops in the areas are those employing the labor of women and children. Such crops do not pay wage rates sufficient to insure either adequate individual or family earnings except in cases where the family contains a larger than average number of workers. Considerable labor in the permanent camps is spent at pre-harvest operations and this employment, as a rule, does not yield as high a return to labor as do the harvest operations.

Again, the standard camps become a headquarters for many workers between the serial work periods of crop areas in which mobile camps offer housing during actual work seasons.



Weekly earnings possible with full-day employment vary considerably between crops and areas due to the wide differences in piece-work wages. In some crops, as for instance, machine-staked peas, sugar beets, potatoes, and some of the fruit, the 1941 wage rates were at levels which would give incomes comparable to those obtained by unskilled workers in industry, if full employment had been provided. In other crops such as berries, cherries, and, in the main, all crops and operations which family is or, the raising of the employment index to 100% would still leave the earnings exceedingly low.

If there is to be any decided improvement in the lot of the workers in these crops, or if employers are to be able to hold their workers in the face of competing employment, an effort must be made both to improve employment conditions and adjust wage rates.

Comparison of the average weekly earnings for the three years 1939 and 1941 shows that while more full employment increased weekly earnings, the most significant increases took place in crops where adjustments in wage rates also were made. This acted as an inducement for workers to remain in the labor market.

If the industry is to take the most effective and conservative means to avoid a labor shortage during the 1942 season, wage rates must be adjusted before the season starts instead of waiting until the pinch of scarcity makes such changes mandatory. Otherwise workers will tend at the beginning of the season to go into other types of employment.

## RELATIONSHIP OF WAGE RATES TO EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS

There is a decided difference in weekly employment and earnings between residents of permanent camps and mobile camps. Less difference is found in average earnings between the different standard camps than between the different mobile camps, but the earnings in standard camps are much lower than the average earnings in the majority of the mobile camps.

Permanent camps, in general, house workers during periods of idleness as well as of employment, and they pay the best wages. The actual degree of under-employment is determined by agricultural workers.

While the permanent camps are set up in areas where a variety of crops is grown, and where consequently one would expect a fairly all-round distribution of employment, many of the crops in the areas are those requiring the labor of women and children. Such crops do not pay wages rates sufficient to insure either adequate individual or family earnings except in cases where the family contains a larger than average number of workers. Considerable labor in the permanent camps is spent at pre-harvest operations and this employment, as a rule, does not yield as high a return to labor as do the harvest operations.

Again, the standard camps become a headquarters for many workers during the critical work periods of early and late in which mobile camps often operate during actual work seasons.



Mobile camp sites are chosen in areas of intensive labor demand in one or two crops and generally are set up only for harvest operations. Workers who live in these camps consequently tend to have more full employment than do workers in the same crops where the acreage is more scattered or smaller, and where therefore no camp is located. There is some reason to believe, indeed, that employment and earnings of agricultural laborers in all FSA camps in this Region are higher than those of workers outside the program, since Farm Placement Service offices in each of the camps help the residents to obtain dovetailing and supplemental work. In addition, the concentration of workers in the camps invites direct employer contact. There is therefore much less time lost in the random search for employment that is so characteristically a part of the migratory worker's life.

Nearly 75% of the workers in the camps reported they had obtained the jobs they held either through the Employment Service or direct employer contact. Only a very small percentage found their jobs through chance or deliberate search. Most of the remaining 25% had had either previous work connections or had obtained their employment through correspondence with the employer.

An additional aid toward higher earnings lies in the concentration of workers resulting from the Migratory Labor Camp program. This means better dissemination of information regarding crop conditions, fields of high productivity, and employers paying less or more than the prevailing scale. This type of knowledge tends to increase the average earnings of camp occupants. This concentration enables the Employment Service more efficiently to route laborers to new jobs. Contacts with a large group of workers are constantly available. The Employment Service acknowledges the camps as an essential factor in the performance of their function as the responsible labor recruiting and dispatching agency.

In some intensive areas where mobile camps are located, the crop acreage is not concentrated and the fields are widely scattered. Camps in these areas function mainly as recruitment and employment centers in which the worker is housed during the period before work starts or in times of unemployment between jobs. Upon receiving an assignment for work he leaves for accommodations supplied by the employer. Such camps as for instance Wenatchee and Omak show low employment indexes and therefore low earnings which are out of line with the actual employment and earnings of workers in these areas. Over half the workers in such camps generally remain in the camp less than four days.

Under-employment was actually greater in these camps than is reflected by the employment reports. Instructions covering the collection of the data require the omission from the enumeration of registrants living in the camp (or locality) less than the full week.

Employer attitude, which in some Regions tends to make the employment and earnings reports from residents of FSA camps unrepresentative, due to discrimination, are not present in this Region, since in general, the camps have been placed in the localities at the specific request of growers.







## COMMENTARY ON TABLES

1. The 1941 season witnessed a considerable improvement over 1940 in the employment and earnings of agricultural workers. This improvement was a necessary adjustment to the relative scarcity of workers and the alternative employment opportunities afforded by the expansion of industry. While the increase in earnings improved the position of farm laborers over the preceding year, the increases did not narrow the wide gap between their earnings and the earnings of industrial workers. It merely reflected the increase in the cost of living. (Tables 2 and 3.)
2. A wide range of actual weekly earnings of employed workers, and their possible earnings with full employment was found between the various migratory labor camps. The range in actual earnings between some of the camps was due in part to under-employment. More significant however is the fact that if workers did have full employment there would still be a difference of 400% in the average incomes of workers registered at the various camps. This difference in earnings possible with full employment between camps is a direct reflection of the differences in earning opportunities at existing wage rates provided by the harvest of various crops in the Northwest. (Table 1.)
3. A notable difference in the types of workers registered in the various camps was found. Reports from single workers comprise only 4.1% of all reports received from standard camps, while 22.7% of all reports from mobile camps were from single workers. The camps located at Merrill, Tule Lake, and Athena, Oregon, and at Blackfoot, Rupert, and Shelley, Idaho, were in potato, sugar beet, and machine-picked pea areas. In these camps the ratio of single workers to family workers is high. In such camps as Independence, West Stayton, and Gresham, Oregon, and Auburn, Washington the workers were engaged in harvesting hops, berries and beans. Family labor was used to a very large extent in the harvesting of these crops, and the percentage of single workers is low,--even lower than the percentage of single workers in the standard camps.

In general, where individual worker-earnings are high the camps show a high percentage of single workers; where individual earnings are low family workers predominate. (Table 1.)
4. Apparently few workers in the camps are employed at pre-harvest operations. Only a limited number of crops show any workers employed until actual harvest operations begin. Those crops making a maximum demand for workers reach both their peak requirements and the completion of the harvest within a 4-week period. (Table 2)
5. Nineteen forty-one gave a longer employment period in most crops. This was of material assistance in stretching the available labor supply, and by affording more continuous employment raised individual earnings even in crops where no wage rate changes occurred. (Tables 2 & 3)



...a considerable improvement in the quality of the work...  
...the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...

2. A large number of subjects were employed in the work...  
...the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...

3. A further investigation in the same work...  
...the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...

4. In general, the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...

5. The results of the work...  
...the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...  
...the results of the work...



6. In nine of the camps the workers were entirely dependent upon one crop for their employment. In ten other camps one crop accounted for at least 70% of the man-days employment reported. Dependence upon one crop, however, does not seem to result in a lowering of the employment index or average weekly earnings. Indeed it is in those camps largely dependent upon one crop that the highest employment index and highest weekly earnings were reported. (Table 4.)
7. Non-agricultural employment (mostly in processing plants and other industries allied to agriculture) is mainly obtained by workers in standard camps; however, the mobile camp at Athena where machine-picked peas are harvested reported nearly 40% of the family heads employed in the pea cannery. (Table 5)
8. During 1940 the crops having the largest percentage of workers unemployed were those requiring principally male adult workers. The 1941 season shows considerable improvement in this respect over 1940.

Favorable weather during harvest operations, maturing season, market conditions that promoted uninterrupted harvests, and the smaller labor force meant most employable adults were working.

Not to be neglected in an appraisal of the improvement, however, is that higher earnings for family heads meant that some family members withdrew from the labor market in these crops. Nearly all older children and women in the migrant families will report they are seeking work when the earnings of the family head are low, even though no employment opportunities are present for them, due either to the nature of the crop being harvested or to established local habits of employment. (Table 6.)

9. The employment of several family members is not the primary factor in family income, since the distribution of the average number of workers per family shows no direct relationship to the size of family earnings. (Table 7.)
10. Where individual worker-earnings are high, heads of families contribute a large percentage of the family income. When the average worker cannot earn sufficient to provide for the family other family members must be employed. Thus less than  $1\frac{1}{2}$  workers per family are reported in the 10 crops where average earnings of workers are above the median weekly earnings of \$13. While an average of 2.5 workers per family are required in the 10 crops yielding less than the average income per worker. (Table 8.)
11. One-third of all family workers were employed at work in six major crops which did not yield the average worker more than \$8.00 a week. Beans and berries were crops in which the largest shortages of labor were reported, yet even the employed workers received work during







only one-half of their available time. Even had full employment been possible for these workers during the picking period they could not have earned more than \$10.00 a week. (Table 8)

12. Crops with low returns per worker require that even young children make their contribution to the family income. The importance of children 14 years and under to the family earnings in these low-paid crops is seen from the fact that workers in this age group average from 5 to 18½% of the total employed family workers, and that nearly 50% of the children earn from 20 to 30% of all the income of their respective families. (Table 9.)
13. The productivity of workers in any crop is influenced by a variety of factors—acreage yield, weather conditions, employment and labor management customs, and type of worker, among others. Superficial judgments as to the earning possibilities of workers in given crops are often made on the basis of the most efficient workers' productivity under ideal conditions. A realistic approach to the problems of adjusting wage rates to make for equality of earnings between crops and in estimation of labor needs requires the use of tables of worker productivity as evidenced by normal field conditions. (Table 10.)
14. While the increase in wage rates is in some cases rather large, it must be kept in mind that piece-work rates for farm laborers have been in an extremely depressed state for a number of years owing to the huge surplus of labor ready and willing to work at almost any wage during the depression.

The reader is advised to appreciate the daily earnings that are associated with these rates as shown by the worker productivity figures given in Table 10. (Table 11)



as follows: (a) The first part of the report is devoted to a general survey of the situation in the country.

The second part of the report is devoted to a detailed study of the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country. This part of the report is divided into three sections: (i) The first section deals with the general economic situation of the country. (ii) The second section deals with the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country. (iii) The third section deals with the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country.

The third part of the report is devoted to a detailed study of the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country. This part of the report is divided into three sections: (i) The first section deals with the general economic situation of the country. (ii) The second section deals with the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country. (iii) The third section deals with the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country.

The fourth part of the report is devoted to a detailed study of the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country. This part of the report is divided into three sections: (i) The first section deals with the general economic situation of the country. (ii) The second section deals with the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country. (iii) The third section deals with the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country.

The fifth part of the report is devoted to a detailed study of the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country. This part of the report is divided into three sections: (i) The first section deals with the general economic situation of the country. (ii) The second section deals with the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country. (iii) The third section deals with the various factors which are influencing the economic development of the country.



Table 1

EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS OF EMPLOYED WORKERS, BY CAMPS  
1941

<u>Camps</u>	<u>Number of Workers</u>	<u>Employment Index</u>	<u>Average Weekly Earnings</u>	<u>Earnings Poss With Full 6 Days Employ.</u>	<u>Single Workers</u>
<u>STANDARD CAMPS</u>					
Twin Falls	671	74.9%	\$ 14.59	\$ 19.48	30
Granger	958	76.2	13.96	18.32	24
Yakima	711	72.0	12.70	17.63	18
Walla Walla	463	63.9	10.71	16.76	49
Caldwell	695	61.1	10.20	16.69	32
Yamhill (Dayton)	411	62.4	7.97	12.78	7
. . . .					
<u>MOBILE CAMPS</u>					
Athena	340	78.8	23.00	29.19	122
Shelley	206	70.5	20.38	28.91	76
Malin	116	81.0	20.79	25.66	36
Tule Lake	94	77.8	19.91	25.58	25
Merrill	111	88.5	22.32	25.22	10
Medford	154	74.1	18.33	24.74	37
Blackfoot	215	62.7	14.41	22.98	29
Omak	37	80.6	17.65	21.89	12
Rupert	42	94.8	20.67	21.80	14
Nampa	215	78.4	16.87	21.52	54
Nyssa	543	68.7	14.56	21.20	102
Wilder	823	79.4	15.96	20.10	154
Driggs	347	57.1	11.03	19.33	72
Payette	42	97.2	17.76	18.27	13
Wenatchee	58	65.8	11.21	17.03	8
Odell	90	66.5	11.24	16.90	7
Grants Pass	379	82.6	13.88	16.81	21
Toppenish	122	64.3	10.71	16.66	29
Independence	133	61.5	9.50	15.45	11
Coberg	364	70.1	8.37	11.94	34
Pleasant Home	169	55.3	5.25	9.46	8
Gresham	241	61.7	5.50	8.91	7
Brewster	92	67.2	5.85	8.71	5
North Plains	133	57.4	4.92	8.58	1
Auburn	141	62.5	5.35	8.56	24
West Stayton	563	60.4	4.93	8.16	26
Victor	223	54.3	4.24	7.81	37







TABLE 2

EMPLOYMENT INDEX, AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS, EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS  
EMPLOYMENT AND NUMBER OF WORKERS, BY CROP AND BY MONTH  
1941

[illegible]







TABLE 2 (CONT'D)

-2-

	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER
GENERAL FARM WORK								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	-	21	25	12
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	-	76.6	86.7	69.4
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	-	14.86	16.52	10.25
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	-	19.40	19.06	14.76
GRAPES								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	-	-	45	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	-	-	85.6	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.64	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.12	-
HAY								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	60	63	161	82	59	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	54.7	65.6	63.3	79.7	61.6	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	8.30	11.56	12.03	15.38	13.30	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	15.17	17.62	19.01	19.30	21.61	-
HOPS								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	20	319	784	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	75.0	74.6	82.6	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	12.20	10.46	12.36	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	16.27	14.03	14.93	-	-
LETTUCE								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	79	30	26	45
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	73.8	85.6	62.8	70.0
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	21.34	23.77	15.73	14.93
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	28.90	27.78	25.04	21.33
MIXED FRUITS								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	13	15	50	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	10.0	10.4	65.3	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	1.00	1.00	14.88	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	1.00	1.00	22.77	-	-	-
ONIONS								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	71	14	12	59	216	30	40
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	60.6	69.0	70.8	67.8	86.2	74.4	74.2
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	8.70	11.43	8.00	13.12	16.47	13.63	8.58
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	14.37	16.55	11.29	19.35	19.71	18.31	11.56







TABLE 2

-3-

	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER
ONION SEED								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	32	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	76.0	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	13.53	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	17.79	-	-	-
PEACHES								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	11	156	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	51.5	65.2	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	7.91	14.46	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	15.35	22.18	-	-	-
PEARS								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	214	129	12	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	63.7	72.6	63.9	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	12.71	18.23	20.92	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	19.95	25.11	32.74	-
PEAS, MACHINE-PICKED								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	133	167	-	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	69.4	90.4	-	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	21.30	28.54	-	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	30.68	31.57	-	-	-	-
PEAS, HAND-PICKED								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	178	-	561	32	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	55.5	-	47.4	60.4	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	6.94	-	8.39	8.94	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	12.51	-	17.68	14.79	-	-







TABLE 2 (CONT'D)

-4-

	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER
POTATOES								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	14	47	123	62	670	103
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	71.4	56.7	65.9	38.6	75.1	61.5
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	10.71	10.87	16.95	12.98	21.69	12.48
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	15.00	19.16	25.74	33.66	28.89	20.29
PRUNES								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	221	164	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	62.4	76.9	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	9.76	13.71	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	15.63	17.82	-	-
RUTABAGAS								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61.5
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.54
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.13
TOMATOES								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	40	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	7.00	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	11.67	-	-	-
SUGAR BEETS								
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	213	50	74	30	-	372	268
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	67.5	63.3	58.3	51.1	-	85.4	74.9
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	12.92	9.38	8.66	5.47	-	21.59	17.87
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	19.14	14.81	14.85	10.70	-	25.29	23.86





TABLE 3

EMPLOYMENT INDEX, AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS, EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS  
EMPLOYMENT AND NUMBER OF WORKERS, BY CROP AND BY MONTH, 1940

	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER
APPLES										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	25	38	6	139	296	8	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	64.0	79.8	50.0	58.5	67.9	41.7	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	10.00	13.32	7.17	6.71	8.55	3.88	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	15.63	16.68	14.33	11.47	12.60	9.30	-
BEANS										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	266	372	32	11	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	55.0	66.8	49.0	60.6	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	5.64	8.68	5.00	8.55	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	10.26	13.00	10.21	14.10	-	-
BERRIES										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	10	2	-	80	189	47	-	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	33.3	33.3	-	68.3	69.3	46.8	-	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	1.70	3.00	-	3.58	3.70	1.91	-	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	5.10	9.00	-	5.23	5.34	4.09	-	-	-	-
CHERRIES										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	117	18	-	-	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	68.7	50.0	-	-	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	7.94	4.61	-	-	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	11.56	9.22	-	-	-	-	-
GENERAL FARM WORK										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	9	11	10	13	19	7	8	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	59.3	81.8	80.0	67.3	93.0	71.4	66.7	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	8.11	10.36	11.30	9.00	12.95	10.71	7.00	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	13.69	12.67	14.13	13.37	13.92	15.00	10.50	-	-
HAY										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	2	48	82	61	36	39	19	5
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	54.2	80.6	62.3	59.6	49.8	65.8	46.1	46.7
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	7.00	10.73	8.38	7.62	6.58	7.33	5.68	3.20
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	12.92	13.32	13.45	12.80	13.23	11.14	12.34	6.85

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a general  
discussion of the problem. It is shown that the  
problem is of great importance in the theory of  
the differential equations of the second order.  
The second part of the paper is devoted to a  
detailed study of the problem. It is shown that  
the problem is of great importance in the theory of  
the differential equations of the second order.  
The third part of the paper is devoted to a  
detailed study of the problem. It is shown that  
the problem is of great importance in the theory of  
the differential equations of the second order.

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a general  
discussion of the problem. It is shown that the  
problem is of great importance in the theory of  
the differential equations of the second order.  
The second part of the paper is devoted to a  
detailed study of the problem. It is shown that  
the problem is of great importance in the theory of  
the differential equations of the second order.  
The third part of the paper is devoted to a  
detailed study of the problem. It is shown that  
the problem is of great importance in the theory of  
the differential equations of the second order.



TABLE 3 (CONT'D)

-2-

	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER
HOPS										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	8	20	11	-	296	412	8	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	54.2	85.0	87.9	-	64.3	77.2	83.3	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	6.88	10.35	9.82	-	3.84	7.52	10.63	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	12.69	12.18	11.17	-	5.97	9.75	12.75	-	-
LETTUCE										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	-	38	12	35	37	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	-	62.3	53.5	61.0	63.1	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	-	9.03	5.33	9.37	9.38	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	-	14.49	9.97	15.38	14.87	-
MIXED FRUITS										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	14	24	29	81	36	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	35.7	68.1	55.2	52.3	56.5	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	2.79	6.96	7.93	7.09	6.97	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	7.80	10.22	14.37	13.56	12.34	-	-	-
ONIONS										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	2	-	-	41	54	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	50.0	-	-	43.9	48.2	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	5.00	-	-	5.49	5.57	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	10.00	-	-	12.50	11.58	-	-	-
PEARS										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	2	-	-	-	5	74	58	2	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	66.7	-	-	-	48.3	56.8	53.4	83.3	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	8.00	-	-	-	9.20	8.14	6.62	6.50	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	12.00	-	-	-	19.03	14.33	12.39	7.80	-	-
PEAS, MACHINE-PICKED										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	69	46	-	-	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	60.9	64.5	-	-	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	15.10	16.74	-	-	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	24.81	25.56	-	-	-	-	-





TABLE 3 (CONT'D)

	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER
PEAS, HAND-PICKED										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	21	64	312	33	-	-	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	61.9	46.1	64.9	65.7	-	-	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	7.05	6.23	7.14	6.58	-	-	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	11.39	13.53	11.00	10.02	-	-	-
POTATOES										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	-	-	15	20	46	358	99	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	-	-	62.2	63.3	45.7	65.6	41.4	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	-	-	9.47	8.80	7.28	14.71	6.42	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	-	-	15.21	13.89	15.95	22.40	15.51	-
SUGAR BEETS										
NUMBER OF WORKERS	-	-	92	102	33	14	-	118	162	-
EMPLOYMENT INDEX	-	-	70.0	72.5	52.5	53.0	-	67.7	65.2	-
AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	-	-	9.60	11.47	7.48	5.42	-	14.55	11.94	-
EARNINGS POSSIBLE WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPLOYMENT	-	-	13.71	15.82	14.25	10.25	-	21.51	18.31	-





Table 4

EARNINGS AND EMPLOYMENT OF WORKERS  
IN VARIOUS CROPS, BY CAMPS.  
1941

(Camps and crops arranged by percentage of aggregate man-days)

CAMP	CROP	% MAN-DAYS	NUMBER EMPL'D WORKERS	% AVAIL. WORKERS UNEMPL'D	EMP. INDEX OF EMPL'D WORKERS	AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	EARN'G POSS. WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPL.
GRANGER	ALL CROPS	100.0	958	7.0	76.2	\$13.96	\$18.32
"	Hops	27.0	249	3.1	78.4	11.52	14.70
"	Apples	9.8	86	1.1	82.0	17.94	21.89
"	Peaches	8.8	83	5.7	71.3	15.54	21.78
"	Pears	7.8	91	34.1	62.1	11.75	18.92
"	Potatoes	7.7	82	--	67.6	13.45	19.90
"	Grapes	7.1	63	3.1	81.2	14.41	17.75
"	Sug.beets	4.2	37	2.6	82.9	16.68	20.12
"	Other	27.6	267	6.6	74.8	14.56	19.47
. . . .							
WILDER	ALL CROPS	100.0	823	2.6	79.4	15.96	20.10
"	Sug.beets	22.0	186	1.7	76.6	17.94	23.43
"	Onions	15.6	124	3.9	81.5	15.00	18.42
"	Hops	12.5	88	-	91.7	16.89	18.42
"	Lettuce	12.0	92	2.1	84.6	17.38	21.13
"	Potatoes	7.8	68	2.9	74.0	20.16	27.24
"	Apples	6.4	51	3.8	81.0	14.16	17.47
"	Peas	5.6	72	4.0	50.6	6.99	13.81
"	Hay	5.6	44	4.4	82.6	15.82	19.16
"	Gen. Fm.	2.6	18	-	92.4	17.50	18.53
"	Other	9.9	80	2.4	80.4	14.96	18.61
. . . .							
YAKIMA	ALL CROPS	100.0	711	9.3	72.0	12.70	17.63
"	Apples	38.6	249	6.7	79.5	15.52	19.52
"	Hops	29.4	198	4.9	76.0	9.79	12.88
"	Pears	13.5	104	8.0	66.3	13.85	20.87
"	Cherries	7.6	62	4.6	62.9	11.95	19.00
"	Peaches	3.8	35	7.9	55.2	11.11	20.12
"	Other	7.1	63	12.5	57.7	12.03	20.86





Table 4 (Cont'd)

(Camps and crops arranged by percentage of aggregate man-days)

CAMP	CROP	% MAN-DAYS	NUMBER EMPL'D WORKERS	% AVAIL. WORKERS UNEMPL'D	EMP. INDEX OF EMPL'D WORKERS	AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	EARN'G POSS. WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPL.
Twin Falls	ALL CROPS	100.0	671	6.8	74.9	\$14.59	\$19.48
"	Hay	20.8	149	8.6	69.6	12.50	17.96
"	Sugar Beets	17.7	109	2.7	81.2	18.48	22.76
"	Beans	16.3	105	13.9	77.5	14.76	19.06
"	Potatoes	13.3	75	2.6	88.4	22.23	25.13
"	Onions	10.4	78	3.7	66.9	10.71	16.01
"	Apples	6.6	37	-	89.2	15.43	17.30
"	Grain	4.1	39	13.3	53.0	9.77	18.44
"	Other	10.8	79	4.8	68.4	11.53	18.87
. . .							
Caldwell	ALL CROPS	100.0	695	7.2	61.1	10.20	16.69
"	Sugar Beets	26.4	154	7.2	69.3	13.40	19.35
"	Prunes	12.8	75	3.8	69.1	9.75	14.10
"	Onions	9.1	61	12.8	60.1	9.97	16.58
"	Peas	8.2	75	3.8	52.1	5.36	10.29
"	Lettuce	7.7	58	1.7	54.7	14.24	26.50
"	Potatoes	7.5	61	1.6	49.7	11.15	22.42
"	Hay	5.8	46	25.8	51.6	8.35	16.17
"	Other	22.5	165	5.2	55.2	8.15	14.77
. . .							
Nyssa	ALL CROPS	100.0	543	2.7	68.7	14.56	21.20
"	Sugar Beets	61.8	315	1.9	73.1	16.44	22.47
"	Potatoes	15.4	87	1.1	65.9	14.40	21.85
"	Onions	10.0	62	3.1	60.5	10.73	17.73
"	Hay	8.6	52	8.8	61.5	10.69	17.38
"	Other	4.2	27	3.6	58.0	9.33	16.09
. . .							
West Stayton	ALL CROPS	100.0	563	1.4	60.4	4.93	8.16
"	Beans	100.0	563	1.4	60.4	4.93	8.16

Table 1. Summary of the results of the analysis of variance for the different factors and their interactions.

Factor	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	F-Value	Probability > F
Overall	Between Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Within Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Total	20.00	2			
	Error	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Residual	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Unexplained	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
Treatment	Between Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Within Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Total	20.00	2			
	Error	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Residual	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Unexplained	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
Dose	Between Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Within Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Total	20.00	2			
	Error	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Residual	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Unexplained	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
Interaction	Between Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Within Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Total	20.00	2			
	Error	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Residual	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Unexplained	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
Error	Between Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Within Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Total	20.00	2			
	Error	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Residual	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Unexplained	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
Residual	Between Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Within Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Total	20.00	2			
	Error	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Residual	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Unexplained	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
Unexplained	Between Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Within Groups	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Total	20.00	2			
	Error	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Residual	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32
	Unexplained	10.00	1	10.00	1.00	.32



Table 4 (Cont'd)

(Camps and crops arranged by percentage of aggregated man-days)

CAMP	CROP	% MAN-DAYS	NUMBER EMPL'D WORKERS	% AVAIL. WORKERS UNEMPL'D	EMP. INDEX OF EMPL'D WORKERS	AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	EARN'G POSS. WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPL.
Grants Pass	ALL CROPS	100.0	379	-	82.6	\$13.88	\$16.81
"	Hops	100.0	379	-	82.6	13.88	16.81
. . .							
Walla Walla	ALL CROPS	100.0	463	3.9	63.9	10.71	16.76
"	Prunes	31.6	157	3.1	57.0	8.24	14.44
"	Peas	16.7	58	6.5	81.6	24.15	29.60
"	Cherries	9.4	45	-	59.3	8.07	13.61
"	Tomatoes	8.7	42	-	58.7	5.98	10.18
"	Sugar Beets	8.6	34	5.6	71.6	13.24	18.49
"	Asparagus	6.7	31	8.8	61.3	6.97	11.37
"	Onions	6.4	25	-	72.0	9.84	13.67
"	Strawberries	4.9	37	7.5	38.1	4.81	12.64
"	Other	7.0	34	5.6	59.1	16.47	27.88
. . .							
Athena	ALL CROPS	100.0	340	19.2	78.8	23.00	29.19
"	Peas	94.0	300	19.4	80.6	25.47	31.60
"	Cherries	3.3	23	17.9	36.2	4.35	12.00
"	Other	2.7	17	19.1	41.2	4.71	11.43
. . .							
Yamhill	ALL CROPS	100.0	411	16.5	62.4	7.97	12.78
"	Peas	27.8	119	4.0	59.8	6.24	10.44
"	Cherries	17.2	73	7.6	60.3	8.12	13.48
"	Hops	14.1	56	11.1	64.3	6.77	10.53
"	Gen. Farm	6.5	23	41.0	72.8	11.52	15.82
"	Filberts	6.2	25	21.9	64.0	7.16	11.19
"	Corn	5.2	21	32.3	63.5	9.67	15.23
"	Potatoes	4.0	14	12.5	74.4	13.21	17.76
"	Strawberries	1.9	15	37.5	33.3	4.60	13.80
"	Other	17.1	65	22.6	67.4	10.17	17.08

Table 1. Summary of data for the first section.

Sample No.	Depth (m)	Temperature (°C)	Salinity (psu)	Density (kg/m³)	Velocity (cm/s)	Direction (°)
10.412	0.650	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.413	0.91	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135

Table 2

Sample No.	Depth (m)	Temperature (°C)	Salinity (psu)	Density (kg/m³)	Velocity (cm/s)	Direction (°)
10.414	1.15	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.415	1.40	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.416	1.65	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.417	1.90	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.418	2.15	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.419	2.40	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.420	2.65	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.421	2.90	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.422	3.15	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135

Table 3

Sample No.	Depth (m)	Temperature (°C)	Salinity (psu)	Density (kg/m³)	Velocity (cm/s)	Direction (°)
10.423	3.40	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.424	3.65	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.425	3.90	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135

Table 4

Sample No.	Depth (m)	Temperature (°C)	Salinity (psu)	Density (kg/m³)	Velocity (cm/s)	Direction (°)
10.426	4.15	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.427	4.40	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.428	4.65	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.429	4.90	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.430	5.15	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.431	5.40	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.432	5.65	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.433	5.90	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.434	6.15	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135
10.435	6.40	18.5	35.2	1025.2	1.2	135



Table A (Cont'd)

(Camps and crops arranged by percentage of aggregated man-days)

CAMP	CROP	% MAN-DAYS	NUMBER EMPL'D WORKERS	% AVAIL. WORKERS UNEMPL'D	EMP. INDEX OF EMPL'D WORKERS	AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	EARN'G POSS. WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPL.
Coburg	ALL CROPS	100.0	364	2.4	70.1	\$8.37	\$11.94
"	Beans	92.2	334	2.3	68.9	8.32	12.07
"	Corn	1.7	7	—	61.9	8.65	13.05
"	Other	6.1	23	4.2	66.3	9.57	15.46
. . . .							
Driggs	ALL CROPS	100.0	347	6.5	57.1	11.03	19.33
"	Peas	100.0	347	6.5	57.1	11.03	19.33
. . . .							
Nampa	ALL CROPS	100.0	215	0.5	78.4	16.87	21.52
"	Onions	39.6	72	—	91.7	21.21	23.14
"	Peas	23.7	59	—	66.9	8.90	13.29
"	Lettuce	17.2	33	—	86.9	31.09	35.79
"	Sugar Beets	7.0	14	—	81.0	9.86	12.18
"	Potatoes	3.2	11	8.3	48.5	13.00	16.71
"	Hay	3.0	11	—	45.5	9.27	19.13
"	Hops	2.2	6	—	61.1	8.36	18.40
"	Other	4.2	9	—	77.8	16.33	26.73
. . . .							
Gresham	ALL CROPS	100.0	241	5.5	61.7	5.50	8.91
"	Strawberries	42.7	106	4.5	59.9	6.75	11.26
"	Raspberries	27.7	66	1.5	62.4	4.17	6.68
"	Blackberries	16.7	39	9.8	63.7	3.28	5.15
"	Youngberries	7.1	10	—	43.3	3.70	8.54
"	Hay	2.9	5	44.4	86.7	13.60	15.69
"	Other	2.9	15	—	70.6	6.73	9.54
. . . .							
Shelley	ALL CROPS	100.0	206	5.1	70.5	20.38	28.91
"	Potatoes	57.4	124	6.8	64.8	20.52	31.68
"	Sugar Beets	40.9	73	2.7	78.3	22.16	28.30
"	Other	1.7	9	—	25.9	3.89	15.00

...

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..



Table 4 (Cont'd)

(Camps and crops arranged by percentage of aggregate man-days)

CAMP	CROP	% MAN-DAYS	NUMBER EMPL'D WORKERS	% AVAIL. WORKERS UNEMPL'D	EMP. INDEX OF EMPL'D WORKERS	AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	EARN'G POSS. WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPL.
Black-foot	ALL CROPS	100.0	215	20.7	62.7	\$14.41	\$22.98
"	Potatoes	77.3	171	18.2	61.1	14.20	23.23
"	Sugar Beets	22.7	44	29.0	69.7	15.55	22.30
. . .							
Medford	ALL CROPS	100.0	154	5.9	74.1	18.33	24.74
"	Pears	100.0	154	5.9	74.1	18.33	24.74
. . .							
Merrill	ALL CROPS	100.0	111	2.6	88.5	22.32	25.22
"	Potatoes	100.0	111	2.6	88.5	22.32	25.22
. . .							
Pleasant Home	ALL CROPS	100.0	169	5.1	55.3	5.25	9.46
"	Strawberries	57.2	103	8.0	54.0	5.54	10.26
"	Raspberries	38.0	58	-	63.8	4.38	6.86
"	Other	4.8	8	-	58.3	7.75	13.29
. . .							
Malin	ALL CROPS	100.0	116	-	81.0	20.79	25.66
"	Potatoes	100.0	116	-	81.0	20.79	25.66
. . .							
Independence	ALL CROPS	100.0	133	4.3	61.5	9.50	15.45
"	Hops	91.4	120	4.8	68.2	9.83	14.40
"	Other	8.6	13	-	59.0	6.54	11.09
. . .							





Table 4 (Cont'd)

(Camps and crops arranged by percentage of aggregate man-days)

CAMP	CROP	% MAN-DAYS	NUMBER EMPL'D WORKERS	% AVAIL. WORKERS UNEMPL'D	EMP. INDEX OF EMPL'D WORKERS	AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	EARN'G POSS. WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPL.
Auburn	ALL CROPS	100.0	141	5.4	62.5	\$5.35	\$8.56
"	Beans	36.2	41	10.9	78.0	6.78	8.69
"	Cherries	18.9	29	-	57.5	4.07	7.08
"	Raspberries	18.5	34	-	48.0	3.32	6.92
"	Blackberries	13.2	21	12.5	55.6	2.67	4.80
"	Peas	9.4	10	-	83.3	12.30	14.76
"	Other	3.8	6	-	56.9	9.50	16.68
. . .							
Victor	ALL CROPS	100.0	223	8.2	54.3	4.24	7.81
"	Peas	100.0	223	8.2	54.3	4.24	7.81
. . .							
North Plains	ALL CROPS	100.0	133	5.0	57.4	4.92	8.58
"	Strawberries	88.6	117	2.5	60.4	4.70	7.77
"	Cherries	7.9	11	26.7	55.3	4.91	8.88
"	Hay	3.5	5	-	53.3	10.20	19.12
. . .							
Tule Lake	ALL CROPS	100.0	94	-	77.8	19.91	25.58
"	Potatoes	73.6	68	-	79.2	20.60	26.03
"	Rutabagas	13.2	13	-	74.4	16.77	22.55
"	Other	13.2	13	-	74.4	19.46	26.17
. . .							
Toppenish	ALL CROPS	100.0	122	1.6	64.3	10.71	16.66
"	Corn	24.2	20	-	88.3	21.85	24.74
"	Peas	18.7	23	-	59.4	9.91	16.68
"	Prunes	16.9	24	4.0	51.7	7.17	13.86
"	Pears	8.7	10	-	63.3	8.40	13.26
"	Hay	6.8	10	-	50.0	10.00	20.00
"	Cherries	6.4	7	-	58.2	9.92	17.05
"	Potatoes	5.5	9	-	44.4	7.00	15.75
"	Other	12.8	19	5.0	49.1	7.37	15.00

Table 2. (continued) Employment in manufacturing, 1970-1990

Country	1970	1980	1990	1970-80	1980-90	1970-90
Algeria	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Argentina	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Australia	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Austria	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Belgium	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Canada	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Denmark	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
France	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Germany	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Greece	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
India	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Italy	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Japan	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Korea	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Spain	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sweden	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Switzerland	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taiwan	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
United Kingdom	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
United States	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
West Germany	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Yugoslavia	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



Table 4 (Cont'd)

(Camps and crops arranged by percentage of aggregated man-days)

CAMP	CROP	% MAN-DAYS	NUMBER EMPL'D WORKERS	% AVAIL. WORKERS UNEMPL'D	EMP. INDEX OF EMPL'D WORKERS	AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS	EARN'G POSS. WITH FULL 6 DAYS EMPL.
Odell	ALL CROPS	100.0	90	7.3	66.5	\$ 11.24	\$ 16.90
"	Apples	90.5	76	1.3	75.4	12.03	15.94
"	Pears	9.5	14	31.6	92.3	14.00	15.17
. . .							
Brewster	ALL CROPS	100.0	92	2.2	67.2	5.85	8.71
"	Raspberries	70.1	62	1.6	71.1	6.60	9.28
"	Strawberries	29.9	30	3.2	60.6	4.03	6.66
. . .							
Payette	ALL CROPS	100.0	42	8.7	97.2	17.76	18.27
"	Prunes	92.7	37	2.6	102.3	18.57	18.16
"	Other	7.3	5	37.5	60.0	9.80	16.33
. . .							
Rupert	ALL CROPS	100.0	42	2.3	94.8	20.67	21.80
"	Sugar Beets	71.1	29	3.3	97.7	23.03	23.58
"	Other	28.9	13	-	88.5	15.38	17.39
. . .							
Wenatchee	ALL CROPS	100.0	58	-	65.8	11.21	17.03
"	Apples	100.0	58	-	65.8	11.21	17.03
. . .							
Omak	ALL CROPS	100.0	37	-	80.6	17.65	21.89
"	Apples	100.0	37	-	80.6	17.65	21.89
. . .							

Summary of Financial Data

Category		Period 1		Period 2		Period 3	
Revenue	Item 1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Item 2	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Item 3	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Expenses	Item 4	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0	75.0
	Item 5	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
	Item 6	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Net Income		25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Total Revenue		175.0	175.0	175.0	175.0	175.0	175.0
Total Expenses		125.0	125.0	125.0	125.0	125.0	125.0
Net Profit		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Average Revenue		58.3	58.3	58.3	58.3	58.3	58.3
Average Expenses		41.7	41.7	41.7	41.7	41.7	41.7
Average Net Profit		16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7



Table 5

Single Men and Heads of Families Who Were Unemployed, Employed In Agricultural Work Only, and in Non-Agricultural Work Only, or Both by Camps

<u>Camps</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Unemployed</u>	<u>Agri. Only</u>	<u>Non-Agri. Only</u>	<u>Agri. and Non-Agri.</u>
REGION	7,932	952	6,015	853	112
WASHINGTON	2,035	318	1,416	270	31
Granger	582	30	487	59	6
Walla Walla	460	59	302	88	11
Yakima	700	226	373	96	5
Auburn	112	2	88	13	9
Omak	28	-	22	6	-
Toppenish	118	1	112	5	-
Wenatchee	35	-	32	3	-
IDAHO	4,057	418	3,143	435	61
Caldwell	730	133	505	87	5
Twin Falls	623	47	502	63	11
Athens	516	95	256	163	2
Blackfoot	159	23	124	12	-
Driggs	174	7	159	8	-
Nampa	157	4	135	9	9
Nyssa	573	30	524	16	3
Payette	36	-	31	5	1
Rupert	32	-	21	1	-
Shelley	175	23	144	8	-
Victor	126	31	89	6	-
Wilder	756	25	644	57	30
OREGON	1,840	216	1,456	148	20
Yamhill (Dayton)	426	164	208	52	2
Brewster	59	-	50	4	5
Coburg	168	-	155	11	2
Grants Pass	169	5	161	3	-
Gresham	101	1	95	3	2
Independence	69	-	61	6	2
Malin	89	-	84	5	-
Medford	161	2	122	34	3
Merrill	95	11	74	9	1
North Plains	95	27	67	1	-
Odell	68	-	48	18	2
Pleasant Home	80	1	78	-	1
Tule Lake	62	-	62	-	-
West Stayton	198	5	191	2	-





Table 6

Percentage of Available Workers Unemployed, by Crops as Taken From  
Reports Where All Employed Workers Were Engaged on Same Crop,  
1941 and 1940

Crop	Total Available Workers 1941	% of Available Workers Unemployed		Average Distance Camp to Job
		1941	1940	
Apples	646	1.2	6.1	10.3 miles
Apricots	34	5.9	—	10.3
Asparagus	35	2.9	—	5.4
Beans	1165	1.6	3.1	4.0
Blackberries	62	8.2	—	2.6
Carrots	25	0.0	—	7.8
Cherries	332	4.2	3.6	8.5
Corn	99	12.1	—	8.8
Filberts	32	21.9	—	7.0
General Farm	119	18.5	23.0	7.8
Grain	76	3.9	—	9.0
Grapes	61	0.0	—	6.2
Hay	433	9.7	17.7	6.0
Hops	1163	2.6	4.0	5.1
Lettuce	198	0.5	14.1	7.1
Misc. Fruit	54	1.9	8.0	5.7
Onions	458	2.8	0.0	6.9
Onion Seed	31	0.0	—	4.2
Peaches	183	4.9	—	9.3
Pears	411	13.1	15.6	7.0
Peas	1195	4.2	5.7	8.6
Potatoes	1067	4.7	10.2	7.7
Prunes	392	1.5	—	7.5
Raspberries	2.6	0.0	—	5.2
Rutabagas	39	0.0	—	5.7
Strawberries	442	4.5	—	6.5
Sugar Beets	1057	3.6	18.1	6.2
Tomatoes	53	1.9	—	6.4





Table 7

Contribution of Heads of Employed Families by Crops \*  
 Arranged by Average Earnings Per Family  
 1941

	<u>Average Weekly Earnings of Empl'd Families</u>	<u>Percentage of Family Heads Who Earned All of Family Income</u>	<u>Ave. No. of Empl'd Wrkrs. Per Family</u>
Machine-			
Picked Peas	\$31.62	52.8	1.4
Hops	28.59	27.3	2.5
Grain	28.48	80.9	1.2
Potatoes	26.13	60.2	1.5
Peaches	22.96	51.9	1.6
Apples	22.90	55.4	1.5
Sugar Beets	21.95	71.4	1.4
Beans	21.90	38.2	2.7
Hand-Picked Peas	21.66	10.4	2.8
Pears	21.40	82.4	1.4
Lettuce	20.54	52.4	1.5
Onions	18.48	55.6	1.4
Prunes	18.48	50.7	1.6
Other Fruit	18.44	40.0	2.3
Cherries	16.94	31.0	2.1
Corn	16.38	75.9	1.3
General Farm	13.59	89.6	1.1
Tomatoes	13.53	42.1	1.7
Hay	13.02	87.6	1.1
Raspberries	12.75	7.7	2.7
Strawberries	12.55	19.3	2.4

\* Taken from reports of bona fide families where all employed workers were engaged in the same crop.





Table 8

Contribution of Heads of Employed Families by Crops \*  
 Arranged by Average Earnings per Employed Worker  
 1941

	<u>Average Weekly</u> <u>Earnings per</u> <u>Empl'd Worker</u>	<u>Percentage of</u> <u>Family Heads Who</u> <u>Earned All of</u> <u>Family Income</u>	<u>Families With</u> <u>One or More</u> <u>Workers Empl'd</u>	<u>Number of</u> <u>Employed</u> <u>Workers</u>	<u>Average No.</u> <u>of Employed</u> <u>Workers</u> <u>per Family</u>
Machine-					
Picked Peas	\$22.50	52.8	200	281	1.4
Potatoes	16.90	60.2	467	722	1.5
Grain	15.98	80.9	52	60	1.2
Sugar Beets	15.60	71.4	511	719	1.4
Apples	15.25	55.4	225	338	1.5
Pears	15.09	82.4	173	245	1.4
Peaches	14.24	51.9	80	129	1.6
Lettuce	13.90	52.4	67	99	1.5
Onions	13.07	55.6	162	229	1.4
Corn	13.06	75.9	55	69	1.3
Gen. Farm	12.93	89.6	78	82	1.1
Other Fruits	12.49	40.0	25	57	2.3
Hay	11.83	87.6	298	328	1.1
Prunes	11.83	50.7	73	114	1.6
Hops	11.45	27.3	249	622	2.5
Beans	8.05	38.2	292	794	2.7
Tomatoes	8.03	42.1	19	32	1.7
Cherries	7.88	31.0	101	217	2.1
Hand-Picked Peas	7.64	10.4	194	550	2.8
Strawberries	5.14	19.3	163	398	2.4
Raspberries	4.75	7.7	79	212	2.7

\* Taken from reports of bona fide families where all employed workers were engaged in same crop.





Table 9

PRINCIPAL CROPS EMPLOYING CHILDREN 14 YEARS AND UNDER  
 Percentage of all Family Workers in Age Group, and  
 Number of Children by Percentage of Family Earnings  
 Derived From Their Labor

---  
Cherries

<u>Percent of</u> <u>Family Earnings</u>	<u>Employed Children</u> <u>14 Yrs. and Under</u>
---	--

Under 10% .....	-
10-19 .....	7
20-29 .....	7
30-39 .....	<u>2</u>

Total	16
-------	----

Percentage of All Family Workers, 14 yrs. and under, 8.5%.

Beans

Under 10% .....	6
10-19 .....	21
20-29 .....	32
30-39 .....	12
40-49 .....	4
50-59 .....	11
60-69 .....	<u>1</u>

Total	87
-------	----

Percentage of All Family Workers, 14 yrs. and under, 18.5%.

Peas (Hand-picked)

Under 10% .....	3
10-19 .....	27
20-29 .....	27
30-39 .....	3
40-49 .....	1
50-59 .....	<u>2</u>

Total	63
-------	----

Percentage of All Family Workers, 14 yrs. and under, 15.1%.





Table 9 (Cont'd)

Strawberries

<u>Percent of</u> <u>Family Earnings</u>	<u>Employed Children</u> <u>14 Yrs. and Under</u>
---	--

Under 10% .....	2
10-19 .....	14
20-29 .....	23
30-39 .....	3
40-49 .....	-
50-59 .....	1
60-69 .....	<u>1</u>

Total	44
-------	----

Percentage of All Family Workers, 14 yrs. and under, 14.3%.

Raspberries

Under 10% .....	-
10-19 .....	8
20-29 .....	5
30-39 .....	<u>3</u>

Total	16
-------	----

Percentage of All Family Workers, 14 yrs. and under, 09.6%.

Potatoes

Under 10% .....	1
10-19 .....	14
20-29 .....	22
30-39 .....	2
40-49 .....	1
50-59 .....	<u>2</u>

Total	42
-------	----

Percentage of All Family Workers, 14 yrs. and under, 5.9%.

Hops

Under 10% .....	2
10-19 .....	18
20-29 .....	29
30-39 .....	6
40-49 .....	<u>2</u>

Total	57
-------	----

Percentage of all Family Workers, 14 yrs. and under, 12.8%.





Table 10

AVERAGE DAILY WORKER PRODUCTIVITY  
IN CROPS AND OPERATIONS PAYING  
ON A PIECE-RATE BASIS

Male Adult Workers Only

<u>Crop</u>	<u>Operation</u>	<u>Unit</u>	<u>Average Worker Productivity</u>	<u>Number Sample</u>
Apples	Picking	Boxes (Bu)	69	144
Asparagus	Cutting	Lugs	9	12
Beans	Picking	Pounds	154	231
Blackberries	Picking	Pounds	70	14
Cherries	Picking	Pounds	188	93
Corn	Picking	Tons	3.4	27
Hops	Picking	Pounds	135	239
Lettuce	Blocking	Acres	0.69	11
Onions	Weeding	Acres	0.38	11
Onions	Topping	Sacks	48	106
Pears	Picking	Boxes (Bu)	73	138
Peas	Picking	Hampers (30 lbs)	12	309
Potatoes	Picking	Sacks (100 lbs)	90	488
Prunes	Picking	Boxes (60 lbs)	29	77
Raspberries	Picking	Pounds	42	40
Raspberries	Picking	Crates	5	44
Rutabagas	Topping	Tons	1.3	10
Strawberries	Picking	Pounds	96	105
Strawberries	Picking	Boxes	86	25
Sugar Beets	Hoeing	Acres	0.94	46
Sugar Beets	Blocking & Thinning	Acres	0.30	25
Sugar Beets	Thinning	Acres	0.48	102
Sugar Beets	Topping	Tons	5.1	480







Table 11

## PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE IN WAGE RATES 1940-41

	<u>Season</u>	<u>Apr.-Jun.inc.</u>	<u>July-Aug.inc.</u>	<u>Sep.-Oct. inc.</u>
Percentage increase 1940 to 1941	30.0%	10% - 20%	20% - 30%	30% - 40%

## AVERAGE WAGE RATES - 1940 - 1941 - AND PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE BY CROP

<u>Crop</u>	<u>1940 Rate</u>	<u>1941 Rate</u>	<u>Percentage Increase</u>
All Crops for Year - - - - -			30%
Appricots	30 ¢ Hr.	35 ¢ Hr.	17.
Apples (Harvest)	4 ¢ Bx.	5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ Bx.	32
Apples (Thin)	30 ¢ Hr.	35 ¢ Hr.	17
Beans (Handpicked)	1 ¢ LP.	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ LB.	25
Beans (Machine)	25 ¢ Hr.	35 ¢ Hr.	40
Blackberries	1 ¢ Lb.	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ Lb.	50
Boysenberries	1 ¢ Lb.	1 $\frac{1}{4}$ ¢ Lb.	25
Cherries	1 $\frac{1}{4}$ ¢ Lb.	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ Lb.	20
Hay	25 ¢ Hr.	31 ¢ Hr.	25.
Hops (Harvest)	1 $\frac{1}{4}$ ¢ - 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ Lb.	1 3/4 ¢ - 3 ¢ Lb.	50
Hops (Cultivate)	25 ¢ Hr.	30 ¢ Hr.	17
Onions	5 ¢ Sack	7 ¢ Sack	40
Peas (Handpicked)	25 ¢ Hamper	30 ¢ Hamper	20
Peas (Machine)	40 ¢ Hr.	50 ¢ Hr.	25
Pears	4 ¢ Bx.	5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ Bx.	38
Potatoes	4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ Sack	6 ¢ Sack	33
Raspberries	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ Lb.	3 ¢ Lb.	20
Sugar Beets	86 ¢ - \$1.30 T.	86 ¢ - \$1.30 T.	0
Youngberries	1 ¢ Lb.	1 $\frac{1}{4}$ ¢ Lb.	25



PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE IN WAGE RATES 1940-41

Percentage Increase	Season	APR.-JUN. 1940	JUL.-SEP. 1940	OCT.-DEC. 1940
1940 to 1941	30.0%	10% - 20%	20% - 30%	30% - 40%

AVERAGE WAGE RATES - 1940 - 1941 - AND PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE BY GROUP

Group	1940 Rate	1941 Rate	Percentage Increase
All Groups for Year - - - - -			
Apprentices	30¢	35¢	17%
Apples (Harvest)	4¢	5¢	25%
Apples (Tins)	30¢	35¢	17%
Bananas (Harvest)	1¢	1¢	0%
Bananas (Tins)	25¢	30¢	20%
Blackberries	1¢	1¢	0%
Boysenberries	1¢	1¢	0%
Cantaloupes	1¢	1¢	0%
Cherries	25¢	30¢	20%
Citrus (Harvest)	15¢ - 20¢	20¢ - 25¢	33%
Citrus (Tins)	25¢	30¢	20%
Cucumbers	5¢	7¢	40%
Onions	25¢	30¢	20%
Pears (Harvest)	40¢	50¢	25%
Pears (Tins)	4¢	5¢	25%
Potatoes	4¢	5¢	25%
Raspberries	2¢	3¢	50%
Sugar Beets	60¢ - \$1.30	80¢ - \$1.30	0%
Youngberries	1¢	1¢	0%